

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

<b>SUNNI NOBLE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 16-CV-316-SMY-PMF</b>
	)	
<b>LIEUTENANT MCALLISTER, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**YANDLE, District Judge:**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Philip M. Frazier (Doc. 18) recommending the denial of Plaintiff's motions for preliminary injunction (Docs. 14, 15). No objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b)(2); SDIL-LR 73.1(b). For the following reasons, the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Frazier is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.

Plaintiff Sunni Noble filed suit presenting Eighth Amendment civil rights claims against three correctional officers, stemming from separate and distinct incidents occurring on May 11, 2014 and June 4, 2014 (Doc. 1). In his subsequent motions for preliminary injunctions, Plaintiff alleges that he has been deprived of his medication while at Lawrenceville Correctional Center by physician John Coe (Doc. 14) and that the mailroom staff continues to open his legal mail (Doc. 15).

Where timely objections are filed, this Court must undertake a *de novo* review of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), (C); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); SDIL-LR

73.1(b); *Harper v. City of Chicago Heights*, 824 F. Supp. 786, 788 (N.D. Ill. 1993); *see also* *Govas v. Chalmers*, 965 F.2d 298, 301 (7th Cir. 1992). Where neither timely nor specific objections to the Report and Recommendation are made, however, this Court need not conduct a *de novo* review of the Report and Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Instead, the Court should review the Report and Recommendation for clear error. *Johnson v. Zema Systems Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999). A judge may then “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Judge Frazier thoroughly discussed and supported his conclusion that Plaintiff has not demonstrated an entitlement to injunctive relief. The Court fully agrees with Judge Frazier’s findings, analysis and conclusions and adopts his Report and Recommendation.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: July 11, 2016**

**s/ Staci M. Yandle**  
**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**